

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the official action dated September 15, 2006, and the references it cites. Claims 1-77 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 13, 25, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, and 73 are independent. In the official action, claims 1-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In addition, claims 73-77 were indicated as allowable. Accordingly, claims 73-77 will not be discussed further herein. By way of this response, the applicants have amended claims 1, 13, 25, 35, 37, 43, 47, 49, 53, 55, 56, 61, 62, 67, 68, and 75. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-36 are compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, the applicants have amended claims 1, 13, and 25 to recite, “wherein the scaled approximate reciprocal of the divisor value is determined using a compound exponent value.” Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 constitutes statutory subject matter. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, multiplying via a multiplier..., extracting via a bit extractor..., and determining via a remainder value generator... and, thus, claim 1 constitutes statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection from independent claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 13 constitutes statutory subject matter. Claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, “to increase an operating efficiency of a processor system in connection with determining a remainder value.” The applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 produces the useful, concrete, and tangible result of increasing an operating efficiency of a processor system in connection with determining a remainder value and, thus, claim 13 constitutes statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection from independent claim 13 and all claims dependent thereon.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 13, 25, 43, 49, 61, and 67 also constitute statutory subject matter for at least the same reason as discussed above in connection with claim 13. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection from independent claims 13, 25, 43, 49, 61, and 67 and all claims dependent thereon.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 37 constitutes statutory subject matter. Claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, calculating via a multiplier..., extracting via a bit extractor..., and computing via a remainder value generator... and, thus, claim 37 constitutes statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection from independent claim 37 and all claims dependent thereon.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 55 constitutes statutory subject matter. Claim 55 recites, *inter alia*, extracting via a bit extractor... and computing via a remainder value generator... and, thus, claim 55 constitutes statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection from independent claim 55 and all claims dependent thereon.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark G. Hanley/
Mark G. Hanley
Reg. No. 44,736
Attorney for Applicants
Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC
(at customer number **34431**)
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312.580.1020

Dated: **March 15, 2007**